

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina

No. of Judges: 1

Round: #4

Room: M336

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba HL

Team Name: BC-EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Danny Huang Allen Liu

Amina Egeh Terry Lee

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

*lots of repetition*

Team Score 156  
200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score 154  
200

*should define terms first*

*iffy word choice*

*no local mapping*

Judge's Comments: First Proposition

*definitions: past-revolutionary*

Judge's Comments: First Opposition

*sketch of the past = history*  
*not necessarily glorifying*  
*learned from past genocide?*  
*please*  
*support genocide cause are last*  
*educated? → no*  
*in the case of Germany*  
*should have mentioned attacks from Spanish & French revolution*

- ① Disrespectful to victims of dictator
  - ↳ bad form of propaganda (stability)
  - ↳ lingering propaganda (politics)
  - ↳ messy transitions
  - ↳ art as a tool of persuasion
  - ↳ education
- ② Weakens an unstable society
  - ↳ assuming
  - ↳ double standard that works

- ① prof to argue your own case
- ② preventing us from acknowledging

Second Proposition

Reputation  
↳ art is a form of expressions that can gain support.  
↳ art

Rebuttal  
↳ repeated partner's pts. → *superficial*

Second Opposition

Reputation  
↳ respect ppl in support of dictator in their society → *do they live in a free society?*

① Democratic society  
↳ allow for all opinions to be heard (not all their societies gain democracy so they rot)

↳ practically... ok... no single  
↳ outrage → *will break late. ex: Libya.*

*please read map*

*organizational*

*it's not your priority*

① Revolutionary cause  
↳ absence of art is what is art?

*no much repetition*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUHAMMAD SALIM

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: M 234

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brynn Meekel Dylan Lemmon

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 72    |
| 100   |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec KM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Michelin Emma Katz

| Score |
|-------|
| 72    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 70    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 145 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 142 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

6:32 sec

Deb - ~~1 min~~

Cont Public agency  
 ① collection security  
 Main point - slow  
 Chris movements  
 Propaganda material

POI T  
1

POI G  
1

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Clash

8:05

good point  
clashed directly

POI T  
No Responses

Cont Imp of visual proof

POI G  
1

Need construction

①

Decent 4:07

②

Second Opposition

7:10

Clash zone attempt at

POI T  
1  
good answer

Rebuild

POI G  
1  
1

Second Proposition

Clash - you're - Not dead

8:11

Canadian Society  
 Russia meets Germany  
 Replaced with Stalin Statue.  
 Burning WH (How connects with resolution)  
Rebuild  
Not done

POI T  
1

POI G  
1  
1  
1

Cont partial attempt

Cont Education values  
 same as first speaker

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amir Khouzam

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zade Shapiro

Christopher Virtue

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 74    |
| 100   |

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MWT - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 76    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 151        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 153        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Good introduction, use of historical examples.  
Be careful of definition: you essentially defined a "society" as a "society". Some judges won't like this.  
- good presentation of final speech.

Second Proposition

Structure is important - lets the judge follow the ~~the~~ logical flow of your argument.  
Good P.O.I, ~~take more~~ ~~time~~ ~~speech~~. Good grasp of knowledge: careful of timing.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Very good use of <sup>\* work</sup> <sup>an</sup> <sup>illustration</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>final</sup> <sup>speech</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>speech</sup>  
Abrogated our history  
- Careful of dividing what are essentially 2 points:  
history is good for education and where do you draw the line into it. Be definitions between points is required.

Second Opposition

Very good point about imagery taking new meanings.  
Very good speech, excellent analysis.  
Be confident in your speech.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Peena Smith

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M325

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: quebec - FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zawad Hassan

Francesca Fagnoli

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS - NR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bhreagh Ross

Ryan Nearing

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 166 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 164 |
| 200 |

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

good road map

Second Proposition

good road map

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

good road map

overall solid debate.

Second Opposition

good road map.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emma O'Rourke

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M137

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Sukhushin

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Areeb Joum

Nava Naamin

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 151 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 166 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

Some very weird definitions - the UN v almost certainly the wrong actor to choose for this round. By ~~limiting~~ attempting to limit the definition of art to strictly propaganda work, sensibly lowered your burden.

**Second Proposition**

Refutation was not particularly clear, hindrance of society needed development.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

Great job laying out the opp case -> would have been fitted from more organized & clearer refutations to the job material.

**Second Opposition**

I really enjoyed your argument about the significance of historical art, but it came out very late in your speech which made it difficult for you to engage. Excellent refutation.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Rebyson

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: M137

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SK

Team Name: Gask SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Sivkhushin

Areeb Salim

Nasra Youmin

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>79</u> |
| 100       |

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>77</u> |
| 100       |

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>82</u> |
| 100       |

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>84</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>156</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>166</u> |
| 200        |

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- Very good delivery
- Perhaps conceded too much in rebuttal - "keep portraits"
- > Don't use UN

**Second Proposition**

Good delivery.  
Point about tension in society ~~would~~ could have been more convincing with examples

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- Versailles - great!
- Focus more on the "All" aspect things like Versailles
- > Use more concrete examples e.g.
  - Chinese Art after revolution

**Second Opposition**

Great delivery  
Excellent focus on UN  
~~Do~~ Try to give more examples like Versailles (your partner used that one)  
e.g. -> Pyramids after those pharaohs fell would be done in ~~the~~ after new rulers appear, in their plan.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Penner

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: M137

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Svitkhushin

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Sask SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Areeb Salim

Nasim Moamin

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 134 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|      |
|------|
| .168 |
| 200  |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Not sure why the model was set up as UK, it left you vulnerable to attacks.  
Excellent style  
Second argument about there being no "archaic" value was assertive (and false)

Second Proposition

Work on having more clearly delineated new analysis, I felt your new argument was largely derivative of your partner's material

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Good structure + analysis; strong rebuttal in reply speech.  
I wasn't terribly convinced by the "the people will be reminded of the new regime" point.

Second Opposition

Work on time management, you had to rush your constructive argument at the end.  
Excellent responses.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Will Gibson

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M 33

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Sask TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Abdul Rehman

Gulraiz Tariq

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Janna Shapiro

Eric Laurin

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 147 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 149 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- It was unclear why you set the house as the UN  
- speech (ultimately didn't matter)  
- More problematic was refusing to engage with all art, speaking only of statues
- Your arguments about dictatorship and psychology were interesting but could use more social and less individual analysis
- The Hitler example might not have been a great idea. Its relevance was tenuous and spending a lot of time on it was kind of a red herring  
- Give more P.O.I.s!

Second Proposition

- Great argument about symbolic presence, would have liked to see it earlier (maybe in PM speech) and analyzed more deeply
- Make sure to reconstruct partner in a way that adds positively to the round; don't just repeat them.
- Adequately responded to main arguments of opp but didn't respond to historical point quite persuasively enough

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good introduction and case stance
- Main problem was repetition and lack of deep constructive analysis (see below)
- Also make sure constructive isn't only negative (e.g. its not so bad...)
- Good pol ↓
- Great summary speech though, asked exactly the right questions.
- ~~Results~~ - Good refutation, managed to undermine Gov contentions ↓

Most of MO constructive material should have been in first speech

Second Opposition

- Good, dynamic speaking style
- Great analysis about positive externalities of artwork generally & specifically
- Remember, focus speech at the speaker/judges not the opponents. ☺
- Could have done clearer refutation; was difficult to follow and give credit for



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jim Collins

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6

Room: M130

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Marcovitch

Melissa Cape

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff

Christina Taylor

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 153 |
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 158 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- Your 2 care points were perhaps not different enough (except present/future) to help w. strong defense of resolution.

Good delivery & logic on the whole.

**Second Proposition**

- A little difficulty developing 3rd care point. Interesting pt. re memory, but not convincing as relevant.

- Repetition

Try to remain coherent throughout

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

Good style.

Rational, logical care def. & development overall.

**Second Opposition**

You developed key pt. re sacrifice / suppression well.

Good team support.

Diffic. for both sides lay in definitions of art, propoganda, democracy.

Good use of POI on the whole, though some obvious pts. not challenged

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SARAH

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: 32G

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia FB

Team Name: British Columbia KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn      Clarissa Brisseau

Jamal Dumas      Armaan Kassem

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 162 |
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 154 |
| 200 |

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Good caseline. Good style.  
 Try to have more variety in arguments  
 → 2 contentions of art being oppressive  
 and destruction being unifying.  
 PMR — more thematic in analyzing  
 burdens

**Second Proposition**

Good speech. More organization.  
 Also, point out when arguments are  
 under developed.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Good speech. SPEAK SLOWER  
 Good caseline.  
 Condense your arguments to two.

**Second Opposition**

You need to reconstruct more.  
 Good style.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Ryan Rogers

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: M326

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - FB

Team Name: British Columbia - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Clairissa Brissedu

Jamal Dumas

Armaan Kessidm

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 83    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 80    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 75    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 163 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|                |
|----------------|
| <del>152</del> |
| 200            |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**REASON FOR DECISION →**  
 Prop had the better Constructive Case and engaged better with the material in the round. Opp misunderstood some of Prop's points. Prop did a lot of good rebuttal, while Opp failed to refute some of Prop's points.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

Confident, strong speaker. Your two constructive points brought valuable material to the round. I especially liked the real-life comparison to the banning of Nazi and Soviet symbols. Ultimately, your points were well explained and you hit the important prop points, answering POs well along the way. You also asked very good POs. Your build-down speech was quite good and brought clarity and focus to the round while resummarizing the key aspects of both cases.

**Second Proposition**

I like how you differentiated history and glorification, that is a very important distinction, and emphasized the goal of 'closure'. You called the male speaker 'Madam Speaker' three times haha. I think your speech could have benefited from increased organization, so ensure you make full use of things like sign-posting and road-mapping, this also helps avoid repetitiveness and keeps you more on track. I also could tell if you had a new constructive point - make it clear where you are in your speech and which point you are rebutting. Your rebuttal was quite comprehensive and thorough - good!

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

You need to slow down your talking pace and take a breath. I feel like because of your pace I may have missed things or not understood them properly. I think you misunderstood the argument about the banning of Soviet and Nazi symbols. Try organizing your speech in terms of constructive material and then separate, point-by-point rebuttal instead of embedding scattered rebuttal during your constructive. I felt like a lot of your arguments went in circles and needed to be flushed out, and analyzed, more in order to be effective. You provided no concrete examples of how the lack of art could actually push a society back into dictatorship.

**Second Opposition**

You had a good build-down speech which captured the central themes of the round, but again spoke why too fast. I think you misunderstood Prop's argument about the role of statues - they never said keeping statues would encourage people to want the dictatorship back - they said it keeps former victims from obtaining true closure. Make your rebuttal more organized by going point-by-point in your rebuttal, and separating your rebuttal from your rebuild. Your first constructive point was quite well explained and clashed well with Prop's points. The link between destroying statues and preventing democracy was not properly explained though. You had a good confident speaking style.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra Miko No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: M326

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS - FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

~~Aizlin~~ FLynn

Clarissa Brisseau

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC - KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jamal Dumas

Armaan Kassam

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 163        |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 154        |
| 200        |

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Very good analysis.  
Way to capture the  
essence of the topic.

Second Proposition

Aizlin ~~may~~ way to  
keep the focus alive.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Saw a huge growth  
from earlier today.  
Try not to put too  
much into one speech.  
~~more~~ Less is sometimes more.

Second Opposition

Armaan, well  
done. Good points  
but keep focus.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alan Grand

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M230

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MB - FT

Team Name: NF - PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ella Thomson

Jacques Flom

Leo Plumer

Christoph Pille

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>73</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>76</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>75</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>148</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>151</u> |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*1984 was an unfortunate choice for a model.  
Good presentation*

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*I was hoping someone would be able to mention at least one great work of art that would have been (or was) destroyed by a revolutionary mob.*

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lorelie DeRoose

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M230

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba FT

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ellie Thomson

Jaclyn Flom

Leo Plumer

Christop Pike

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 154 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 155 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

good set up of debate.  
needed more relevant  
examples  
not sure relation re:  
Elizabethan

Second Proposition

need a final constructive point  
that is significantly different

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

v. good analysis, just need  
more confidence and flow

Second Opposition

v. good analysis

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathleen Butler

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M230

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba FT

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ella Thomson      Jaclyn Flom

Leo Plumer      Christoph Pike

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 155        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 157        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Broad definition of artwork worked against you.  
Good points, handled POIs well.  
Strong presentation

Second Proposition

Strong delivery  
Good points

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Pointed out flaws in proposition's logic.  
Refuted well

Strong summary, great closing line.

Second Opposition

Great presentation  
pointed out inconsistencies of logic.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M132

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: British Columbia KT

Team Name: Saskatchewan WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner

Zephi Kramer

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

163

200

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

169

200

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Strong organization!  
Arab spring point deserved more time, though.  
Could have capitalized on need to break with the past*

Second Proposition

*Choice of historical examples wasn't ideal, which ended up undermining your points  
Strong delivery style*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*strong POIs  
Very strong points on educational role  
Very effective summary/rebuttal*

Second Opposition

*Your point about the legitimacy of the new government was particularly strong and deserved more time*



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lyle Dobbin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M132

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Bc KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner

Zephi Kramer

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: JK WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 160 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 170 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- very compelling style (Beatles are the only intro quote I tolerate)
- Not clear how art serves to perpetuate a cult of personality after the leader has fallen
- Arab Spring was best content, should have been first + longer
- Stalin example was interesting but weak
- Examples need to be followed by ~~more~~ more analysis, can't stand on their own
- Good clash with how loyalists would use the art

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Framing by actors, great strategy
- Impt. of context - good
- Solid rebuttal of cult of personality

Second Opposition

- Resentment point = best in round - "Rolling point"
- The value of symbols ✓
- solid direct rebuttal

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: José Judol

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: 132

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

Team Name: Sask WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bon Turner

Zyhi Kramer

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 87    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 163 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 172 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Prop did not effectively deal with the substantial lines of analysis presented by opp. Opp did a good job dealing with the Prop position and material.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Burg

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M319

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Ontario SM

Team Name: Ontario UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarange Marathe Alastair Smith

Denizhan Uylsu Valentin Litvin

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 155        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 167        |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Strong analysis, but largely rhetorical. Didn't use examples until rebuttal. Needed to use more POIs.

Aggressive attack and logical contention development. Good POIs added a lot to the case. Backed up arguments well.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

A bit ramble - needed to address a strong POI. Good extension, but needed practical help.

Nice job in sustaining the case line - extension helped well. Rebuttal a bit difficult to follow - stick to signposts with so many contentions.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cam Climie

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 319

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Terang

Alastair

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan

Valentin

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 155 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 167 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- The crux of the case why CRT is somehow unique from documents (appeal to emotion) came @ 3:50 of the PMR.  
- Offer POIs.

**Second Proposition**

Don't use model quibbles to avoid substantive clash.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Excellent speech, excellent POIs.

**Second Opposition**

Be more organized in clash

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Romeo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M319

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: ON SM

First Speaker:

Tarang

Second Speaker:

Alastair

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>79</u> |
| 100       |

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>76</u> |
| 100       |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ON-UL

First Speaker:

Denizhan U.

Second Speaker:

Valentin Litvin

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>85</u> |
| 100       |

| Score     |
|-----------|
| <u>81</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>155</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| <u>166</u> |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Give more POIs!

Rebuttal speech should be more thorough + responsive to the "best" of OPP's case

Second Proposition

Give More POIs

More structure would be helpful and unfortunately your constructive point was shaky

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

U. solid speech, very good POIs

Not alot of criticism

Second Opposition

More strict organization would have been easier to follow your otherwise great examples + arguments.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: D. Neal

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: M328

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: QC-BR

Team Name: QC-TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat Sabrina Roy

Dan Ton-That Jeremy Obrand

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

| Score         |
|---------------|
| <del>80</del> |
| 100           |

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 156        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 165        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Speaks a bit too fast.
- Nice development of ideas.
- Good organization.
- Good passion
- Avoid going past allotted time.

Second Proposition

- Good speaker.
- A bit repetitive. Didn't bring much new argumentation.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good speaking ability.
- Too much use of "ladies and gentleman" It distracts from the message
- Nice wrap-up.

Second Opposition

- Good passion & conviction.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katherine Au

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: N-328

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Frank Bisset

Samira Roy

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 79    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Kim-Trot

Jessamy Obsand

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 82    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 83    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 156 |
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 165 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- In a round about censorship, setting out clear criteria and showing ways to meet them would have helped make your case more cohesive.
- great organization
- reply speech could have engaged with the opposition arguments more.

**Second Proposition**

- clear points
- more direct refutation would have been beneficial
- maybe more clearly show how destroying this art doesn't erase history

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- nice, clear constructive
- maybe could have made the link between how art = history more
- maybe how art is a snapshot of the conditions of society in which that art is created... would have helped solidify the case.

**Second Opposition**

- great point about how prop's case takes on the characteristics of the dictatorship they want to forget
- more thorough refutation would be effective

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Virginia Robertson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M328

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Sabrina Roy

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Quebec To

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Don Ton-That

Jeremy OBrand

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 156 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 167 |
| 200 |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition Sarah

- clearly defined the terms + established context
- Destroy values of the old regime → help promote democratic ideals (1st pt)
- Destruction of artwork ... will show that the fallen dictator is condemned (2nd pt)
- logical + competent speaker
- did not clearly define what type of artwork would be considered in need of destruction ↑??
- Don't your choice considered propaganda?

Who is "he"?  
post-revolutionary societies? who decides?

Summary/Rebuttal: organized + clear + stated arguments in an open manner  
- not respectful of time constraints

Second Proposition Sabrina

- presented her approach and what points she would advance.
- was Napoleon was a "horrible" dictator
- dictators' artwork that has a propagandist nature should be destroyed ...
- questioned opposition's points + clearly refuted their statements.
- Doesn't strike strong about very creative art? Why should it be destroyed??

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition Don

- answered questions well
- clearly stated points of view and used several good examples to substantiate points.
- artwork = culture, history, values = should not be destroyed. Use the past to learn for the future. Role of museum is to preserve the past.
- effective speaker; organized + logical

Summary/Rebuttal:  
- focused on major areas of contention  
- clearly stated + explained points of view  
- effective presentation  
- logical, organized, clear presentation  
- good summary

Second Opposition Jeremy

- clear + logical speaker
- good questions (Poi)
- summarized partners points and presented 2 new arguments.
- "People have a right to know their past."
- fear of slipping back to totalitarian rule.
- Egyptian Pyramids = good example of artwork that is valuable.
- Do we have the right to alter history ... ?? = question??
- Good summary + good refutation!



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JOHN VIATTOGIANNIS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M344

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA KP

Team Name: ONTARIO AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

KELSEY KEDDY      JERIC PAUIG

NATE WINSOR      CONNOR AHLUWALIA

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 87    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 160 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 169 |
| 200 |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Did a commendable job with a tough proposition  
- Articulate speaker / good command of structure  
Argument: you mentioned "glorification" and the difference between "public" and "private" displays, but didn't exploit it as fully as possible.  
Second Proposition Interesting argument  
Articulate expression of a subtle idealism, saving the integrity of artists  
Tone - at times - was a little frantic  
Passion is good, but your intelligence and articulate delivery are sufficient to get points across.  
Good use of POI's.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Very articulate  
Intellectually sharp / coherent argumentation and structure  
Stylistic point - distribute eye contact evenly around the room  
Presentation } good use of  
"Analytical study" } vocabulary  
Second Opposition Effective use of POI's  
Extremely articulate presentation  
Excellent command of the intellectual dimension of the resolution  
Demonstrated the ability to listen and carefully dissect the opposition's argument  
- Excellent use of the hyenas / "Triumph of the Will" allusion.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Auman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: End

Room: 344

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: NS KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kebeey

Jeric

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ON AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nate

Connor

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 88    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 167        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 174        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

EXCELLENT ROUND

Basically, didn't engage enough w/ dangers of relapse.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Excellent use of 20 speaker material in LOR

Second Proposition

Argument about artist's integrity was v. interesting, but not clearly connected to the round.

Second Opposition

Great examples, in service of a nuanced and powerful argument.

Everyone: more P.O.I.s.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Mary Kate Jackson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 344

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia JP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Keddy

Jeric Pauig

| Score                       |
|-----------------------------|
| <del>82</del> <del>82</del> |
| 100                         |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nate Winsor

Connor Ahluwalia

| Score                       |
|-----------------------------|
| <del>83</del> <del>83</del> |
| 100                         |

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|            |
|------------|
| <u>100</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| <del>100</del> <del>100</del> |
| 200                           |

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- really good definition -- not too tight, but clear and specific.
- give more P.O.I.s.
- both of your speeches were well-organized.

Second Proposition

- Some good points, but you could have expanded (ex. post-post-rev.soc.)
- good catch re: regime.
- work on speaking a bit more slowly. Passion is good, but you don't want people to miss what you're saying.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- the idea of precedent was interesting, and well-presented.
- give more P.O.I.s.
- your 4-minute speech somewhat lacked organization.

Second Opposition

- smooth natural style
- sophisticated connections.
- art as culture argument was well-developed.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Holly Kallmeyer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 343

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba-PT

Team Name: BC 04

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistori US

Adrienne Tessier

Sherwin Yousef Zahdeh

Yesha Ouyang

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153

200

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

158

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- spend less time at the beginning of the round talking about general things
- good organization
- (but there was no popular revolution against Hitler)
- make argument about victims more tangible

**Second Proposition**

- Safety argument was muddy
  - ↳ it seemed like you were advocating for censorship of those who supported dictators by displaying their art for their protection
  - ↳ this censorship wasn't justified
- The idea that a short end of the revolution was good and should have been expanded
- Prop had to respond to opp's view of history.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Good job
- Talk more about why the dialogue that this art creates is good in a post-revolutionary society

**Second Opposition**

- Refutation was solid
- "Precedents" arguments are dangerous (slippery slope), but you did it well

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Chalk

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M343

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Pistorios Adrienne Tessier

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: BC - OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sherwin Yousef-Zadeh Veska Ouyang

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 156        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 158        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Debate generally lacked depth of analysis or good clash. Strongest point of contention was opp's history point which prop failed to meet with sufficiently deep refutation.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Howard

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 343

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan

Adrienne

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC OR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin

Yasha

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 162        |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 168        |
| 200        |

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

RFD: This was a good round overall. ~~benefited~~ from, at least briefly, discussing the effect that art could have on post-revolutionary societies in the Middle East. That being said, we judged the round based on the arguments made and examples used.

Opp wins on 3 grounds:

① Art is a way of conveying history. Prop response is that history textbooks are to somewhat undermine the case ~~set~~ out with the past REMINDS victims of

Second Proposition

~~are~~ all. Perhaps it is important to distinguish between the two

② Opp makes a cunning argument about victors being able to ~~write~~ write history. The only response is that those dictators are ONLY an ~~Army~~ oppressive group (as opposed to <sup>all</sup> minorities & past groups). This argument needed to be made ~~more~~ adequately addressed for prop to win the round,

③ MC safety argument → sounds like ppl's views ~~should~~ can legitimately censored if violence against you. Opp points out that this runs counter to principles of freedom of expression.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

We think that both sides could have benefited from, at least briefly, discussing the effect that art could have on post-revolutionary societies in the Middle East. That being said, we judged the round based on the arguments made and examples used.

Second Opposition

Prop response is insufficient in both MC & PMR. The ~~response~~ response seems sufficient. ~~In order to off~~ This response seems sufficient. In order to off This response seems sufficient. In order to off This response seems sufficient.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J Schurme

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M 340

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wrightman Michael Henke

| Score |
|-------|
| 72    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Baumgart Kristen Schumaker

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 145        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 149        |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Arguments skirted fundamental issue on art's value as art & not for propaganda

Second Proposition

Some good points made in reputation  
no new arguments

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Reputation is OK.  
Widened context to include ancient revolutions

Second Opposition

Argumentation is forced.  
Constructive points were clearly separated from reputation.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patricia Castle

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M340

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Manitoba HW

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman Michael Hanks

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Helen Beaumont Kirsten Solmundson

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 146 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 150 |
| 200 |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Team Comments: the most important arguments come out in 2nd speech. Newer really got to the heart of the issues -> artist were forced to make art -> will it inspire future generations?

A ochwitz isn't art, don't talk about the most essential issue" said with 15 seconds grace

Second Proposition

why

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Examples were only semi accurate

More analysis

Second Opposition

this ~~res~~ contentious?

actors

- artists
- oppressed ppl
- dictators
- new gov



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: G. BURGAL

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M340

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: MANITOBA HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ANTHONY WIGHTMAN

MICHAEL HONKE

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MANITOBA SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

HELEN BEAUMONT

KIRSTEN SOLIMUNSON

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 167 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 162 |
| 200 |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments: 8:15  
First Proposition

VERY GOOD JOB ON THE ARAB SPRING (AND ASSOCIATED STATES, ~~ESP.~~ IRAQ), BUT I FOUND IT SURPRISING THAT YOU LEFT OUT OLDER EXAMPLES, SUCH AS STALINIST ART POST-USSR

I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT AUSCHWITZ IS A VALID EXAMPLE OF ART — AS A HISTORICAL SITE, YES, BUT HARDLY ART

WASN'T VERSAILLES TO THE GLORY OF FRANCE, QUALITATIVELY DISTINCT FROM A STATUE OF SAODAM?

Second Proposition 8:15+

CERTAINLY THE ROMAN SENATE BELIEVED CAESAR WAS MAKING HIMSELF A DICTATOR — THAT'S WHY HE WAS ASSASSINATED

YOU SEEMED TO SUGGEST THAT IT IS IMPORTANT FOR A NEW GOV'T ELIMINATE POTENTIAL RALLYING POINTS FOR THE REMNANTS OF THE OLD REGIME — YOU SHOULD HAVE MADE THAT EXPLICIT

Judge's Comments: 6:38, 3:36  
First Opposition

IT IS QUITE A STRETCH TO ARGUE THAT CAESAR & THE SPHINX QUALIFY AS EXAMPLES OF ART IN POST-REVOLUTIONARY SOCIETIES

VERSAILLES WAS BUILT BY LOUIS XIV, NOT XVI, BUT IT WAS AN EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO 1ST ARR'S POL

Second Opposition 7:44

IF POST-REVOLUTIONARY PEOPLE DON'T DEMAND THE END OF DICTATORIAL SYMBOLS, WHY DO THEY KILL DOWN STATUES + OTHERS (E.G., THE BASTILLE)

NAZI GERMANY WAS DEFEATED IN WAR — HOW WAS IT POST-REVOLUTIONARY IN 1945?

THE SLIPPERY SLOPE OF 1984 WAS A VERY POWERFUL ARGUMENT INDEED — IT DESERVED A MORE THOROUGH EXPLICATION

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: NATALIA SLEPNEVA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO KK

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA OR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

TAE-HU KIM

ANSON KWOK

DEBI OGUNRINDE

OLIVER BJÖRNSSON

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 87    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 79    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 88    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 166        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 172        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Opposition was largely on the strength of the arguments about the importance of preserving historical evidence of a regime and allowing future generations to understand the experiences of those who lived under the regime, and how art offers a unique and more powerful window into that past. Opp also showed how destroying the ~~art~~ material about the problems

Second Proposition

print and symbol could have been better, gov showed less engagement with the historical analysis offered by opp. and needed to ~~offer some comparative analysis~~ why the historical significance was significantly outweighed by the needs of the present day.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

While opp's responses to gov's of the art as a rallying ~~point~~ <sup>(and this material stands in part of some minor tensions on opp)</sup> art could spark more conflict. Opp

Second Opposition

While opp's responses to gov's of the art as a rallying point could spark more conflict. Opp

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Murphy O'Connor

No. of Judges: \_\_\_\_\_

Round: \_\_\_\_\_

Room: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON-KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Anson Kwok

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 84    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 79    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrode

Oliver Björnson

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 88    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 86    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 163        |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 174        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION

**OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lauren Shadley

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M329

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Anson Kwok

| Score |
|-------|
| 87    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde

Oliver Björnsson

| Score |
|-------|
| 88    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 166 <sup>4</sup> / <sub>5</sub> |
|---------------------------------|
| 200                             |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 174 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Onyiah

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M-3

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: British Columbia A02

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madelan Armstrong

Jonan Rai

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair Meach

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 149        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 151        |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Poor Modelling; More  
Case & New*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*Concise - good*

Second Proposition

*More relevant  
examples in  
the context  
of the record*

Second Opposition

*Better Structure*

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matt Blundell

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 341

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sonam Madeline

Sonam

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 149 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 150 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / **OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Should have been a bit round with no actor  
debate got very messy  
Cost benefit analysis should have been clearer

**Second Proposition**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Don't focus on the model flaws  
point it out more on

**Second Opposition**

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aaron Schachner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M34

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: British Columbia AC

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeleine Armstrong Saranam Rai

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff Blair MacNeil

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 151        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 153        |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

Good structure  
~~clear~~ can't show the good  
 points to make, stuck with a  
 definition.

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

Very strong arguments about  
 historical memory  
 focus less on the definition, criticize  
 more constructive.

**Second Proposition**

Interesting point  
 about catharsis  
 Try to develop argumentation  
 for all your time.

**Second Opposition**

Interesting arguments about  
 abolition of it  
 focus less on definition, didn't  
 see point in Holocaust denial  
 arguments.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: L310

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba-ML

First Speaker:

Nic Martin

Second Speaker:

Thomas Lamothe

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 88    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 83    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia-MS

First Speaker:

Julia Milden

Second Speaker:

Zack Santella

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 87    |
| 100   |

|       |
|-------|
| Score |
| 77    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 171 |
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the (please circle):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 164 |
| 200 |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Very Strong Speaker
- Good Examples
- Good Final Rebuttal, but point about long-term effects not well proven.

Second Proposition

- Good speech.
- Be careful about repeating partner's points too much.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Very Strong Speech
- Better organization in both construction/rebuttal would be helpful.

Second Opposition

- Don't let POI's throw you off.
- Better organization needed.



Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Muir

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: L310

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: MB - ML

Team Name: BC - MS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamotte

Julia Milden

Zack Santella

| Score |
|-------|
| 88    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 87    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 170 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 162 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Great Performances

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Great Job.

Second Proposition

Really good work  
the short / long term  
consequences dicotomy  
should have been built into  
the structure of your speech  
more overtly

Second Opposition

Try not to let the  
POI's put you off your  
flow.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brian Schmitt

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: 310

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: MR - ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lanthier

| Score |
|-------|
| 88    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: B.C. - N.S.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sullivan

Zach  
M/Mrs Smetalla

| Score |
|-------|
| 87    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 170 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 163 |
|-----|
| 200 |

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

Great opening speech, there was a model issue but it never became important, Good style and clarity.

Good summary speech and effective summary

**Second Proposition**

Spent too much time on introduction and on restating points, though you were overall fairly good.

Refutation could have been more robust.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

Speech was good, but lacked refutation and your constructive, while good, was lacking in variance

The reply speech was good, but had a fair amount of new stuff.

Speech was excellent but more attention to detail would take you a long way

**Second Opposition**

Speech was somewhat messy and you had perhaps much constructive in your speech. More time should have been spent refuting/rebuilding.

You also got flustered by p.o.'s, which affected your delivery

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Will Hiscock

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: N333

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - KC

Team Name: QC → GR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho

Alif Karmali

Karen Butt

Megan Cagliano

| Score |
|-------|
| 71    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 144        |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 149        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: L Chalmers

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 333

**PROPOSITION**

Team Name: Alberta KC

First Speaker:

Stephan Cho

Second Speaker:

Alif Kamali

| Score |
|-------|
| 71    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: QC GB

First Speaker:

Karen Britt

Second Speaker:

Megan Cagliano

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 145        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 151        |
| 200        |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Talk about role of art in society.  
You have not proved that turning the art work will produce stability. You have assumed it to be true.  
Nice - you finally reply to their question about the link.  
Second Proposition  
Destroy the work of the dictator?  
Orderly argument.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Work to agree to definition of art - Beware rambling.  
Don't allow POIs to interrupt your presentation.  
You undermine your arguments by tossing off your arguments.  
Order + conviction would do much to make your argument credible.  
Second Opposition  
Excellent point - does work of art produce stability.  
But beware the definition - "art work of a dictator".  
Consistently refuses POIs.  
Your argumentation needs stronger organization.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Evam Weffer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M333

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho

Alif Kamal

| Score |
|-------|
| 70    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 71    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: QC GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Karen Butt

Megan Cagliano

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 200 |
|-----|

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 200 |
|-----|

### PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- You need to fill your time, try to come up with more points
- Need to make a stronger case for the tangible benefits of actually having this and around

**Second Proposition**

- The Military point did not make sense, and you mentioned it and never explained it
- Did not refute the main opp points, you need to ~~cover~~ cover them all individually
- Rebuttal your partner's case again, you never talked about how opp used your side

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Good point about undermining the new regime
- Rebuttal speech was weaker but I liked how you pointed out how prop never pointed out why a stability was good

**Second Opposition**

- Liked the point about having 2 sides in a good democracy
- ~~Failed a bit to make a strong case~~
- Good to point out what prop failed to do

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melissa C. Dryden

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 6 Room: L309

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

Team Name: ON KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arthur Hamilton Aaron Fritzler

Daniel Chiang Elliot Kaufman

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 153        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| 169        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION  OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Proposition**

- Well introduced & defined
- Poel well dealt with - propaganda & misconceptions - good
- artwork - misleading good
- Excellent use of examples
- Remember to ask yourself "why"
  - this allows you to connect your statement to the motion

**Second Proposition**

- Excellent Poel - artst
- Well introduced & mapped out.
- Poels very well dealt with!
- Well supported reputation
  - good use of examples
  - excellent explanations
- Freedom must be limited - interesting
- Well organized & explained.

**Judge's Comments:**  
**First Opposition**

- Excellent Poel
- Well introduced
- Learning from, emotional impact - good
  - Help condemn the dictator
- freedom of speech & expression - good!
- points well organized and supported.
- need to learn from history
- not just aesthetics & good
- good summary & reputation

**Second Opposition**

- Post-rev. societies are knowledgeable of the dictators' injustices - good point!
- historical value
- Very well refuted
- Well organized & explained
- Try and attempt giving more Poels.

\* Your numerous Poels demonstrate your engagement - good!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: R. Smith.

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 Room: 1309

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: Sask. FH

Team Name: ON KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arthur Hamilton Aaron Fritzier

Daniel Chiang Elliot Kaufman

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 81    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 114 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|      |
|------|
| 16.7 |
| 200  |

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition Arthur

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition Daniel

- Good choice of questions for final rebuttal.

- Try and give more POI's. Be sure you answer the POI.

Second Proposition Aaron

- Strong refutation.

- Strong Delivery.

- Try and give more solid examples from year 2000 on as that was part of the definition.

- Stayed true to your case.
- Strong rebuttal.

weakest pt was - Injustice to artists.

Second Opposition Elliot

Strong Presentation!

Try and give more POI's.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patrick Peotto

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: L309

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Arthur Hamilton

Aaron Fritzler

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Chiang

Elliot Kaufman

| Score |
|-------|
| 85    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 84    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 155 |
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 169 |
| 200 |

## PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- > clearly organized
- > substantive arguments lacking
- > lost fundamental justice not relevant

Second Proposition

- > well organized
- > well delivered
- > lacking some substance

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- > tightly organized
- > well delivered
- > turned down too many POI
- > very strong reb.

Second Opposition

- > well delivered
- > excellent CLASH, looks well - although found it a little too long
- > should have asked POI



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isabelle Fahmy

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 4

Room: M339

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK - HS

Team Name: NF - WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Brittany Haughey      Nitasha Salim

Kate McNeil      Morgan Walsh

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>81</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>83</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>82</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>84</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|            |
|------------|
| <u>164</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|            |
|------------|
| <u>166</u> |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jake Roth

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 1336

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Saskzk

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rainer Kossio      Kelly Zheng

| Score |
|-------|
| 72    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 73    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: ABRL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan Rowledge      Jason Lamb

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 145 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 165 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Proposition**

- Little note: the debate is not about "revolutionary art."
- Good analysis of propaganda + dictatorial legacies
- Needed more nuanced analysis
- Fill your time!
- Why are victims more important than education? Go deeper.

**Second Proposition**

- Disorganized at times
- Took to many POI
- Some good refutation
- Why should people have the rights that you posit? ~~Why~~

**Judge's Comments:**

**First Opposition**

- Fantastic response to Prop's propaganda argument
- A tad disorganized at times
- Very good analysis of harms
- Clear summary speech
- "Cycle of paying" was strong
- could have used better pillars in your summary speech

**Second Opposition**

- Good analysis on future districts
- I don't know if comparing "Imagine" to Hitler's propaganda is a good idea (just a sidenote).
- Excellent refutation
- Good analysis about educational value

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Simon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6 Room: L336

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: ~~Simon~~ S-ZK

Team Name: AB-RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan

Jason

| Score |
|-------|
| 753   |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 703   |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 83    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 146        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 165        |
| 200        |

~~PROPOSITION~~ / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- o Would have been well served to draw a clearer link between art and hateships
- o PMR very strong

- o good refutation
- o Very strong PMR
- o Could have used examples: eg: Battleship Potemkin

Second Proposition

- o Great speech but needs to deal better with opp material

Second Opposition

- o Some of this material should have come up in the first speech
- o Good analysis

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: James Priclow

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 336

**PROPOSITION**

**OPPOSITION**

Team Name: SASK - EK

Team Name: AB - RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Rainer Kocsis Kelly Zheng

Joan Rowledge Jasen Lamb

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>73</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>72</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>82</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>82</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>145</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

|            |
|------------|
| Team Score |
| <u>164</u> |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SKANDER BUCOVICZ

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M232

## PROPOSITION

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario - NM

Team Name: Quebec - HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloch

Norah Nehmeleh

Andrew Hamilton

Victor Zhao

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>80</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>79</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100       |

|           |
|-----------|
| Score     |
| <u>78</u> |
| 100       |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|            |
|------------|
| <u>159</u> |
| 200        |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

|            |
|------------|
| <u>156</u> |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

*Content, though well structured and organized, was lacking. Model could have been defined better to the advantage of side-government.*

Second Proposition

*Good points were made, but not organized very effectively.*

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

*The points made could have been elaborated for more. Whereas the points made were ~~for~~ very realistic, they could have been elaborated a lot more on by drawing on historical events.*

Second Opposition

*Good analytical points and reconstruction, but weak refutation → (almost none)*

*On another note, use the word "like" less often. (Overall used more than 40 times)*

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: C. Kusel

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 6

Room: 232

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

Team Name: Quebec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

K. Meloche

N. Nehmetullah

A. Hamilton

V. Zhao

| Score |
|-------|
| 86    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 82    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 168 |
| 200 |

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

|     |
|-----|
| 158 |
| 200 |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

- Mention why the art was created in the first place.
- I like your organization. 4 pts were clear.
- why destroyed vs. put away in a museum as part of history/art?
- Maybe define their art as propaganda.
- Good eye contact / Gestures.
- Good POI. (2nd).

Second Proposition

- I like your point about rebuilding. it is difficult/vulnerable.
- Look at what the art means.
- Good 1st point - what is new? - what is new? ....?
- New goal? unclear arguments.

Good you did this later.

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

- Good 1st POI.
- Good eye contact - watch your fidgeting.
- Maybe a definition of art - aestheticism. "art for art's sake"
- slow down a touch so your speaking is a touch clearer.
- Some good knowledge, but you keep going back to same argument.

Second Opposition

- You had no POI's
- slow down when you speak.
- You started off on a good point about what is art... but it was not explained clearly.
- work on organization
- You went off topic - counter-revolutionaries, Egypt.

NO POI'S

- Need to do this more.

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lewis Fainer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M346

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

J.J. Gerstein

Arial Melamedoff

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 77    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 153 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won  
by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 150 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:  
First Proposition

This round came down to what is best for the new society moving forward and the ability to just understand and interpret history. Both these themes were carried by gov. Opp needs to watch out on the borders it tries to set.

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:  
First Opposition

for the new society moving forward and the ability to just understand and interpret history. Both these themes were carried by gov. Opp needs to watch out on the borders it tries to set.

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Stephen McCarthy

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MB GM

Team Name: NFL RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JJ. Gerstein

Ariel Melamedoff

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 159        |
| 200        |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

| Team Score |
|------------|
| 156        |
| 200        |

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Proposition team

- Good point re: representation of cultural v. dictator's history. Could have focused more on that aspect: is the value of art tied up in what it represents?
- Effects of dictator-supportive ~~art~~ art to harm populace OK but could be stronger.

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Opposition team

- Wanted more analysis on representation of art. What is the historical/cultural value (not just assertion that there is one).
- Personal liberties point interesting but needed ~~Second Opposition~~ reconstruction. How is this not a slippery slope?

Good job everyone!



# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aden Kovals-Litau

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 6

Room: 896

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: M6-67

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

D. T. Gestein

Ariel Melamedoff

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 76    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland - RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Silliman

Ariel Pees

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 74    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

151

200

This round was won  
by the (please circle):

Team Score

148

200

**PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION**

### Judge's Comments: First Proposition

- dealt well with a tricky motion
- very smartly focused on the symbolic nature of destroying the artwork and what that would mean for the people of the country
- I would have liked for you to expand on this analysis and explain the emotional implications this might have for the people in terms of closure

### Second Proposition

- strongest speech of the round
- Arguments regarding the misrepresentation of culture + history - ultimately won the round for you → argument could have used more elaboration → i.e. why the people's culture is superior to the dictator's culture

### Judge's Comments: First Opposition

- Be careful about setting burdens for the other team, especially when it is evident that they do not need to meet the burdens you set for them to win
- Had good arguments, but approached the debate with a narrow focus, regarding in the present future deterioration regimes → this debate is about so much more!

### Second Opposition

- Interesting + insightful point about the value of art → I wish it came up in the first speech!
- Good job talking about what we can learn from art about history, but this needed more analysis → i.e. what can we learn from biased or flawed historical sources

# Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Tim Bonnar

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 6 Room: M 342

## PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Will Dawson

Rebecca Sitten

| Score |
|-------|
| 78    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 75    |
| 100   |

## OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hopkins

| Score |
|-------|
| 80    |
| 100   |

| Score |
|-------|
| 79    |
| 100   |

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

| 153 |
|-----|
| 200 |

This round was won by the ( please circle ):

Team Score

| 159 |
|-----|
| 200 |

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Proposition

- strong speaking style - could be a bit faster and a bit more varied
- right from the beginning you need to show why the art must be destroyed - you spend too much time basically explaining that dictators are bad and that there art is just propaganda
- what about the financial aspects
- make sure your POs are questions, not statements

**Second Proposition**

- need to ask at least 2 POs for each speaker
- use your time - both of your main points needed more detail and depth - you had time to do so
- try to look like you're paying attention - even in the final speech of the final round. Playing with your hair doesn't give that impression.

**Judge's Comments:**  
First Opposition

- good opening - the message was effective - but you needed to fully show why the destruction is a problem
- it's a stretch to say that destroying propaganda makes those people exactly the same as the dictators.
- strong speaking style - some added pace would be good

**Second Opposition**

- pace needs more variety - sometimes you should be faster
- clear structure
- more specific details needed
- no real danger of artwork restoring dictatorship? what about the re-emergence of Stalinist support and the restoring of Stalinist art to a place of prominence